incident taking place in Salem district. Therefore it should be brought to the notice of the authorities and if the Police do not take action, certainly the Collector can be approached. It is not necessary to have this House adjourned. I assure the hon. Member that the Government are interested in seeing that they are not exploited and that sufficient facilities are given to them for their development and self-protection. I hope, under these circumstances, the hon. Member would withdraw the motion and will not press it.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : May I know from the Hon. Minister whether the incident is a bruted or as bad as any other incident that takes place in Salem.

SRI K. V. RAMASWAMI : கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொன்ன பிரகாரம் நான் இந்த பிரேரணையை வாபஸ் பெற்றுக் கொள்கிறேன். இதுவிஷயமாக ஒரு விசாரணை நடத்தவேண்டுமென்று நான் மந்திரி அவர்களைக் கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member is not pressing the motion.

(2) POLICE ACTION IN MATHUR VILLAGE.

MR. SPEAKER : I have received notice of another adjournment motion given by the hon. Member, Sri Vinayakam. It runs as follows :—

"That the business of this House stands adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the failure of this Government to instruct the Police authorities to show the ordinary human courtesy and proper treatment to the satyagrahis who take part in the peasants' movement in Mathur village, Sriperumbudur taluk, Chingleput district."

This also is fairly vague but anyway I would like the hon. Member to say what he has to say before granting leave for it.

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am afraid that this is not a vague motion but I submit to what you say. It is not vague in the sense that this Motion refers to a definite matter like the peasants' satyagraha movement which is being carried on in the Mathur village, Sriperumbudur taluk.

Sir, the dispute arose with regard to wages and warams to be paid by the mirasdars to the peasants who take the land on lease. An agreement was reached between the mirasdars and the peasants in the presence of the Tahsildar of Sriperumbudur. The terms of the agreement were agreed upon and a document was made out and it was witnessed by the local people and only during the operation of the agreement, a difference of opinion has arisen and the mirasdars have refused to pay according to the stipulated rate mentioned in the agreement. The result is that the agricultural operations came to a standstill. To vindicate their grievance and

30th September 1955] [Sri K. Vinayakam]

to bring to the notice of the public and the Government, the peasants have started a peaceful satyagraha movement and to support that movement, a few peasants violated section 144, promulgated by the officials on the spot. Sir, this is a peaceful movement where no force has been used. The Police authorities first arrested a few people who took part in the movement and put them behind the prison bars. Sir, I am not now trying to refer to that aspect of the matter which is *sub judice*. I am not concerned with the case which is before the Court. As things developed, the people who took part in the satyagraha movement were taken to prison. But now of late, from 27th instant, they are taken in police lorries to distant places and left there. They are taken to a place 25 or 35 miles from the place where the satyagraha movement is carried on. They are arrested in the morning and kept in the police lorries all through the day and left during the night in the forest areas of Trivellore and Ponneri taluks and near the outskirts of the district, and they are not given food or even water. This has happened on 27th, 28th and 29th and I do not know what is happening to-day. This kind of leaving them in utter darkness without any help and not even the rudimentary requirements of a human being like food and water, is most inhuman and atrocious. Even the British regime did not commit such atrocious acts. Also, persons who are taken from the jail to the Court for the purpose of the case, are being handcuffed. Sir, have you heard of such an instance? Sir, I have in my possession photos taken on the occasion when persons had been handcuffed and one of them was Mr. Adityan who along with another prisoner had been taken from the jail to the Police Court in Saidapet. Is it such a grave offence that these people have committed that they have got to be handcuffed and taken to the Court? Have the Government in their possession any record or report to show that they will run away? Why should such a inhuman treatment be meted out to satyagrahis of this type?

Sir, the other day the Hon. the Leader of the House was kind enough to say that Mr. Adityan was inside the jail of his own accord and if he really wanted to come out, he could do so any moment but he wanted to make a hero out of this movement . . .

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I did not say " Nero ", but " hero ".

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : The Hon. the Leader of the House did not hear me correctly. I only said " hero " and not " Nero ".

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member should be brief in his speech.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Mr. Adityan applied for release on bail but he was asked to produce two sureties with property qualification. He was not allowed to come out of the jail on his own personal bond. The Government are wreaking a vengeance against the person concerned. After all, he is a person with

a position and status and he can be released on bail on his own surety. Why should the Government insist upon two sureties with property qualification? All these things go to show that the Police authorities are transgressing the limits of their power and they are using these unnecessary methods for victimizing the people which are outside the limits of their power. I have made the position clear and in order to get a proper reply from the Government, I want that the business of the House do stand adjourned for this purpose.

Sri P. Ramamurthi: Sir, in 1930 and 1932 when the Congress launched its Civil Disobedience Movement we heard of such a thing and I personally had experience of that. The police at that time, arrested the people who disobeyed the law and kept them in the Police Commissioner's office for the whole day without food and left them outside the City limits—a distance of 10 or 15 miles. At that time, the entire Press of this country raised a hue and cry against the inhuman behaviour of the police. Such a thing had happened when the British Government was ruling this country. Now we have got Swaraj and we have got our own Government. It is unthinkable that the police will be continuing the same bad traditions which have been set up by the police during the British regime. This is exactly that is now happening. Similarly the question of handcuff is there. Even in 1950, I think, when I was arrested in Adoni, I was not handcuffed even though I was considered to be a dangerous person. (Interruption from the Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.) It might be that I might have been handcuffed on previous occasions. But in 1951 when I was arrested, I was not handcuffed even though I was considered to
10-10 a.m. be a dangerous person at that time. But, ultimately, it has been decided as a result of agitation carried on that hand-cuffing should not be resorted to unless it is very essential to do so and unless there is the possibility of the person to be hand-cuffed running away. Therefore, the question involved in the motion is the failure of the Government to instruct the police to behave in a decent manner, in a civilized manner towards people who have not yet been adjudged to be guilty by the Court. I would like this point to be answered by the Hon. Leader of the House.

The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam: I would deal with the points raised by Sri K. Vinayakam first. With reference to the question of releasing S. B. Adityan on bail, the hon. Member alleged that the Government are responsible for his non-release. The hon. Member has not yet passed his Law examination. When he becomes a lawyer he will realize that it is purely within the jurisdiction of the Court to impose conditions for release on bail. We will be trespassing on delicate grounds if we begin to criticise Court orders with regard to bail. It is the usual thing for the Court to grant bail once the matter is before the Court and if any person feels that the order passed by the Court is an unjust order he can take the matter on appeal or revision. Certainly hon. Member Sri K. Vinayakam was not within rights to question the order of the Court and criticise the Government for that order

30th September 1955] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

because it is purely the Court's function. As hon. Members are aware, we have now separated Judiciary from the Executive so that no such charge can be made that the Executive has influenced the action of the Judiciary.

The hon. Member also referred to the peaceful satyagraha which is being organized by peasants. I would like to say a few words on that. On the previous occasion I stated that but for the third party interference this matter would have been easily settled and that was confirmed by the Member of the Assembly coming from that constituency. The further information I have with regard to this so-called satyagraha is that satyagrahis are recruited from rickshawallahs by paying Rs. 5 each man.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : I object to the statement.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : That is the information I have. In case they have to go to jail, they are paid at one rupee per day so that their families may be maintained. That is the sort of satyagraha that is being carried on and we are aware how far the peasants are taking part in the satyagraha. There is no use of carrying on agitations like this. The Government are as much interested in the peaceful settlement of these agrarian troubles and we are much more interested in the well-being of the peasants than any other hon. Member here or any other person outside this House. But it is being carried on for their own purposes.

With reference to the question of S. B. Adityan being hand-cuffed, there are rules regulating hand-cuffing of prisoners and it is only in extraordinary circumstances that a prisoner can be hand-cuffed. I do not know the circumstances. This matter has been brought to my notice only now. It has not been even mentioned in the adjournment motion. Sri K. Vinayakam has been good enough to hand over to me photographs taken on that and I may assure the hon. Member that certainly we shall cause an enquiry into that matter whatever action is required will be taken against any officer if he has misbehaved or if he has overstepped the rules governing hand-cuffing of prisoners.

In any event, Sir, I am afraid, this matter cannot be raised as an adjournment motion.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : What about the question of inhuman treatment accorded to prisoners?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : They are being mentioned for the first time and they have not been mentioned in the adjournment motion. The Hon. Speaker was good enough to say that the matter raised in the adjournment motion was indefinite without any specific incidents given. So, I cannot answer the points raised straightway without getting the necessary information from the appropriate authorities concerned. That is also a matter which will be looked into. In any event, I submit that

this is not a matter which can be taken as an adjournment motion for the purpose of adjourning this House and discussing this question.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : அரசியல் அபிப்பிராய வித்தியாசங்கள் இருக்கலாம். இருந்தாலும், அதற்காக வேண்டி மாற்றுக் கருத்து உடையவர் சிலர் ஒரு இயக்கத்தில் சம்பந்தப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதற்காக பேசக்கூடிய சமயத்தில் அவதூறாகப் பேசாமல், என்னென்ன விவரங்கள் இருக்கின்றன என்று கொஞ்சம் பார்த்துக்கொண்டு பேசியிருந்தால் நன்றாக இருந்திருக்கும். கனம் மந்திரி அவர்களுக்கு ஆதித்தன் மீது கோபம் இருக்கலாம், அல்லது அவர்களிடையே அபிப்பிராய பேதங்களிருக்கலாம். அதற்காக விவசாயிகளைப்பற்றி இந்த அளவுக்கு அவதூறாக பேசவேண்டிய அவசியமில்லையென்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். ஸ்ரீ மணலி கந்தசாமி அவர்கள் விவசாயசங்கத்தின் தலைவர். அவர் அந்த இடத்திற்கு அடிக்கடி போய் நிலைமையை கவனித்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார். ஸ்ரீ ஜீவானந்தம் அவர்களுக்கும் இதில் தொடர்பு உண்டு. அவர்களுக்கெல்லா விவரம் தெரியும். இந்த சத்தியாக்கிரக இயக்கத்தில் பங்கெடுத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிற விவசாயிகள் தங்களுடைய கோரிக்கைகளைப் பெறுவதற்காகத்தான் இதில் பங்கெடுத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகவே மந்திரியவர்களுடைய குற்றச்சாட்டுக்கு அவசியமில்லையென்று நான் தெரிவித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். மேலும் சத்தியாக்கிரகிகள் மீது எடுக்கக்கூடிய நடவடிக்கை நாளுக்கு நாள் அபிவிருத்தி அடைந்துவருகிறது. இன்று சட்ட சபைக் கூட்டம் முடியப் போவதைப் போலீசார் ஆவலோடு எதிர்ப்பார்த்துக்கொண்டிருப்பதாக எனக்கு செய்தி வந்திருக்கிறது. விவசாயிகளிடம் போலீசார் " சட்டசபைக் கூட்டம் இப்போது நடந்துக்கொண்டிருப்பதால்தானே அங்கே போய் மந்திரிகளிடம் சொல்லி கலாட்டா செய்கிறீர்கள். சட்டசபைக் கூட்டம் முடியட்டும் உங்களைப் பார்த்துக்கொள்ளுகிறோம் " என்று கூறி அவர்களைப் பயமுறுத்திக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்களென்று எனக்குச் செய்தி வந்திருக்கிறது. நேற்று அங்கே தடியடிப் பிரயோகம் நடந்திருக்கிறது. இது உண்மை. வேண்டுமானால் வந்திருக்கக்கூடியவரை கனம் மந்திரி அவர்களிடம் அழைத்துவரவும் நான் தயாராயிருக்கிறேன். ஸ்ரீ மணலி கந்தசாமி அவர்கள் மூன்று தினங்களுக்கு முன்பு கனம் முதல் மந்திரியிடமும், கனம் ரெவினியு மந்திரி அவர்களிடமும், " நான் போய் சமரசம் செய்து வைக்கிறேன். யாராவது அதிகாரியை வரச் சொல்லுங்கள் " என்று கேட்டும், இன்னும் ஒரு நடவடிக்கையும் எடுக்கப்படவில்லை. ஆகவே பிரச்னையைத் தீர்ப்பதற்கு முயற்சி செய்யவேண்டுமே தவிர, ஒருவரை ஒருவர் அவதூறாகப் பேசிக்கொண்டிருப்பது கூடாது. அவதூறாகச் சொல்வது என்றால், நானும் இங்கே போலீசாரைப்பற்றி பல விஷயங்களைச் சொல்ல முடியும். உண்மையான விஷயங்களையே சொல்லமுடியும். இருந்தாலும், நான் அந்த மாதிரி விவரங்களில் இறங்க விருப்பமில்லை. அரசியல் கருத்து மாறுபாட்டுக்காக சண்டை போடாமல், விவ்சாயிகள் நன்மையடைய வேண்டுமென்ற நல்லெண்ணத்துடன் இந்தப் பிரச்னையைத் தீர்ப்பதற்கு முயற்சி செய்யவேண்டும் ; ஒப்பந்தத்தை அமல் நடத்தப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். குறைந்தபக்ஷம் ஒப்பந்த்தத்தை எந்த அளவுக்கு அமல் நடத்தமுடியும் என்று பார்த்து, அதற்கு முயற்சி செய்வதுதான் சரியாக இருக்கும். கைவிலங்கு போடுவதைவிட இன்னும் எந்தவிதமாகச் சித்திரவதை செய்வதாயிருந்தாலும் சரி, அதைப் பொறுத்துக்கொள்ளத் தயாராயிருப்பவர்கள்தான் இந்த இயக்கத்தில் கலந்துகொள்வார்களே தவிர, அதற்காக அவர்கள் பயப்படமாட்டார்கள், பயப்படவுமில்லை. அதற்குப் பதில் சொல்லவேண்டிய பொறுப்பு சர்க்காரைச் சார்ந்தது. சர்க்கார் இப்பொழுது குற்றவாளிக் கூண்டில் இருக்கிறதே தவிர, ஸ்ரீ ஆதித்தன் இதை அகௌரவமென்று கருதவில்லை. இந்த விஷயத்தில் சீக்கிரம் சமரசம் ஏற்படவேண்டுமென்று நான் விரும்புகிறேன்.

* SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY : On a point of order, Sir. In the course of his speech, the Hon. the Minister for Finance was pleased to say that the satyagraha movement is more or less a

30th September 1955] [Sri S. Daivasigamoney]

farce and that rickshawallahs and other persons who are not connected with the movement in any way are being employed. This is casting an aspersion against the movement which we consider as a peaceful movement and which has been started for the purpose of achieving a particular purpose, namely, the enforcement of an agreement, as stated by hon. Member Sri K. Vinayakam. Is it necessary, while discussing this motion, to say that the persons who are engaged in this peaceful movement are rickshawallahs and other persons. If the Hon. Minister has got any evidence in support of his statement, let him place that statement that among the satyagrahis so and so are rickshawallahs on the table of the House, or does it mean that he gets information only from mirasdars is not conducted by peasants but by rickshawallahs.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not a point of order.

Sri P. RAMAMURTHI: The Hon. Minister for Finance is a responsible Minister and as such will talk with a great sense of responsibility. He says that it is not a satyagraha of peasants but that rickshawallahs are being engaged. About two hundred people have been arrested and they are in the Central Jail here. Their names and addresses are available with the Government. Immediately after this meeting is over, I am prepared to go with him to the jail. Let him prove that even one out of these two hundred is not a peasant. Has he made enquiries as to how many of these two hundred are not peasants but rickshawallahs? Without making enquiries, it is very wrong to make such a statement. If he has made enquiries, let him place before us the list of persons who are not peasants.

Sri N. K. PALANISAMY: கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் மாத்தூருக்குச் சென்றபோது நானும் சென்றிருந்தேன். உண்மையில் அங்கு ரிக்ஷாவாலாக்கள் மட்டும் இல்லை, விவசாயிகளும் இருந்தார்கள். பக்கத்துப் பிரதேசங்களில் ஒப்பந்தம் ஏற்பட்டிருந்தது. ஆகவே, மாத்தூரிலும் விவசாயிகள் ஒப்பந்தம் செய்துகொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டார்கள். உண்மையில், சர்க்கார் தலையிடாவிட்டால் இங்கும் ஒப்பந்தம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும். சர்க்கார்தான் அங்கேபோய் ஒப்பந்தம் ஏற்படாத முறையில் அங்கேயிருக்கும் மிராசுதார்களிடம் ஒப்பந்தம் செய்து கொள்ளவேண்டாமென்று சொல்லி வந்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்று நான் கண்டிப்பாகச் சொல்லமுடியும். மூன்றாவது ஆட்கள் தலையிடுகிறார்கள் என்று சர்க்கார் சொல்கிறார்கள். அந்த மூன்றாவது ஆட்கள் யார் ? யார் ஒப்பந்தம் செய்துகொள்ள வேண்டாமென்று சொன்னது. கனம் நிதி மந்திரியும் கனம் ரெவினியு மந்திரியும்தான் அவ்வாறு சொன்னார்கள். இரண்டு பேரும் சென்று அங்கிருக்கக்கூடிய மிராசுதார்களிடம் ஒப்பந்தம் செய்துகொள்ளவேண்டாம் என்று சொன்னார்களே தவிர ஒப்பந்தம் செய்து கொள்ளுங்கள் என்று சொல்லவில்லை. அதற்கு சர்க்கார்தான் பொறுப்பு.

அது மட்டுமல்ல. மூன்றாவது ஆட்கள் தலையீட்டினால்தான் தகராறுகள் ஏற்பட்டதாக கூறினார்கள். யார் மூன்றாவது ஆட்கள் போய் ஒப்பந்தத்துக்கு வரவேண்டாம் என்று கூறினார்கள். நேற்றைய தினம் கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்களும் ரெவினியு மந்திரி அவர்களும் அங்கு சென்றிருந்தார்கள். இரண்டு பேரும் சேர்ந்து மிராசுதார்களை பார்த்து இந்த மாதிரி ஒப்பந்தம் செய்துகொள்ளவேண்டாம் என்று சொன்னார்களே தவிர ஒப்பந்தம் செய்துகொள் என்று சொல்லவில்லை. ஆகவே, தகராறு பூராவுக்கும் சர்க்கார் தான் பொறுப்பு. சத்தியாக்கிரஹத்தில் ஈடுபட்டுள்ள

[Sri N. K. Palanisamy] [30th September 1955

வர்கள் அல்ல. அந்த ஊரிலுள்ள இசான்கள்தான். அந்த கிராம இசான்கள் பூராவும் ஜெயிலில் இருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதையும் சொல்லிக் கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன்.''

* SRI P. T. RAJAN : On a point of information, Sir. I should like to know who gave permission to the photographer to take the photo.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : A Press correspondent who was watching the occurrence had the opportunity of taking the photo from a vantage point.

The Hon. Minister for Finance is a responsible Minister and his statements on the floor of this House have got to be respected if they contain truth. He was kind enough to say that only rickshaw-pullers were employed. . . (The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam : I never said ' only '.) He said that some rickshaw-pullers were employed to take part in the movement, that it was not a genuine movement and that daily wages were paid to rickshaw-pullers to assume the role of satyagrahis. The addresses of the two hundred persons in the jail are with the Government. If he proves that even one out of these two hundred satyagrahis is not a peasant, his statement will be taken with credit.

He said also that a peaceful agreement would have been reached but for the intervention of a third party. Evidently he is alleging that some politicians interested in the movement are interfering and trying to see that no agreement is reached. On the other hand, the Government is the third party. It is they that do not want an agreement to be reached between the peasants and the landlords. No other third party and no politician of any kind is interfering against the conclusion of a peaceful agreement. Mirasdars of Mathur village are for implementation of the agreement. But mirasdars belonging to villages other than Mathur abetted by Government authorities are importing labourers from outside the village and trying to carry on agricultural operations. Even with imported labour, agricultural operations are not being carried on properly.

MR. SPEAKER : Let the hon. Member be brief. He is having a second chance to speak.

SRI K. VINAKAYAM : If the Revenue Minister and the Leader of the House are for a peaceful agreement, it is within their capacity to bring it about. The mirasdars and peasants of Mathur are willing to abide by the terms of the agreement.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I am glad the hon. Member has given the assurance that there is a proper atmosphere for settlement. It should be the attempt of everybody to arrive at a settlement taking advantage of that atmosphere. I may assure on behalf of the Government that we will try our best to bring about a peaceful settlement, and I hope the co-operation of the hon. Members of this House and of the parties to the dispute

30th September 1955] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

will be available to the Government. There is no question of vindictiveness. The Government do not gain anything by taking action against the satyagrahis.

As regards the point about Mr. Adityan being ill-treated by the police, in the photograph he is seen wearing a garland and having a book in his hand and it looks as if he is posing for the photo. The hard-hearted police have allowed him to be garlanded and go about with a book in his hand! That is the kind of ill-treatment that is meted out to him! Therefore this matter requires enquiry and a proper enquiry will be made. If hand-cuffing was done against the prevailing rules, action will be taken against the police officer.

There is absolutely no case for adjournment. I may assure the hon. Member that the Government are very anxious that peaceful conditions should be restored in the area and I always welcome co-operation from any quarter, particularly from Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Inasmuch as the hon. Member brought the matter to the notice of the Government and the Hon. Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition have expressed their opinion, I hope the Member is not pressing the motion.

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM: I am not still convinced by his reply. He says that Mr. Adityan was allowed to got with a garland and a book. The book is his private property and somebody might have garlanded him.

MR. SPEAKER: I am asking whether the Member is pressing or not pressing the motion.

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM: I am sorry, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I consider that the terms of the adjournment motion given by hon. Member Mr. Vinayakam do not conform to rule 41. In the first instance, I think it is not fair to hand over to me an adjournment motion of this nature just before the commencement of the Assembly sitting. This adjournment motion really charges the Government and Police authorities with meeting out inhuman treatment to satyagrahis. No details are given; not even the dates are mentioned. I think it is unfair to ask the hon. Member, who is not armed with details, to answer on the spur of the moment a charge of this grievous nature and ask the Members to participate in a discussion of the motion without giving any details. I thought that the hon. Mr. Vinayakam would be content with the assurance of the Hon. Leader of the House that the Government would look into the matter, and not press the motion. Now that he is pressing the motion, I am giving a ruling. The laws of the country are wide enough which can be set in motion to get redress if any person who is man-handled or given a treatment which is not proper and I am perfectly satisfied that the

[Mr. Speaker] [30th September 1955

adjournment of the Assembly is not the proper method. I rule that this is not a definite matter of urgent public importance. The adjournment motion is disallowed.

The next item is the election of one member to the Committee on Public Accounts.

10-30 a.m. SRI S. RAMALINGAM : I want to make a submission regarding the adjournment motion.

MR. SPEAKER : The adjournment motion is over. I request the hon. Members to help me in keeping order and conform to the rules. Now, there is absolutely no matter before the House except the election of a member to the Committee on Public Accounts and I have asked the Hon. the Leader of the House to move the motion. There can be no point of order cn this.

SRI S. RAMALINGAM : I accept your ruling, Sir. Please hear me. கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் மாத்தூர் சத்தியாக்கிரஹ விஷயம்பற்றி பதில் சொல்லும்போது நான் எழுந்து நின்றது, போலீஸ் காரர்கள் ஒருவேளை ஶ்ரீ ஆதித்தனை கைவிலங்குடன் படம் பிடிக்க அனுமதித்து இருந்தால்கூட, அவர்கள் மேல் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்க வேண்டாம், மன்னித்து விட்டுவிடவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளத்தான்.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : கைவிலங்கு போட்டதைப் பற்றி நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கத்தான் விசாரணை நடத்தப்போகிறோம். அப்படி விசாரணை செய்யும்போது, போட்டோ எடுக்கப்பட்டதுபற்றிய கேள்வி யும் வரலாம்.

(Sri K. R. Sambandam rose to a point of order.)

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Is it with reference to the motion that I am going to move?

SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM : No.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Then, please sit down.

V.—GOVERNMENT MOTIONS *RE*

(1) ELECTION OF ONE MEMBER TO THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I move—

" That with reference to rule 171 of the Madras Assembly Rules, this Assembly do proceed on a date to be fixed by the Hon. the Speaker to elect one member to be a member of the Committee on Public Accounts for the financial year 1955-56 in the vacancy caused by the death of Sri A. Ramaswamy Tevar, M.L.A."